



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/089,696	07/24/2002	Yukoh Hiei	0760-0304P	5503
225/2	7590	09/26/2008	EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH			HWW, JUNE	
PO BOX 747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			1661	
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/26/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/089,696	HIEI ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
JUNE HWU	1661	

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —

THE REPLY FILED **22 August 2008** FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a) The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on **22 August 2008**. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): **112(2)**.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: **22-30**

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: **9,12,15,18 and 21**.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fail to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
 See Continuation Sheet

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. Other: _____.

/Anne R. Kubelik/
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1638

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
103(a) over Konzak et al (U.S. Patent No. 6362393) in view of Forreiter (The Plant Cell, vol. 9, pp.2171-2181) and in light of Pierce Biotechnology.

Applicants argue that there is a clear distinction between the instant invention and the prior art in that the plant sample is centrifuged and then the plant sample is in contact with Agrobacterium (p. 10 of response). This argument is not found persuasive because Konzak et al teach a method of transforming plant cells and that the gene transformation could occur at any time of the process. Forreiter was combined with Konzak et al to teach that Angiosperm protoplasts were centrifuged at 600G for 10 minutes. It would have been obvious to try to centrifuge plant tissue instead of plant cells as taught by Konzak et al in view of Forreiter because one of ordinary skill would have tried to centrifuge callus tissue then contact the callus tissue with Agrobacterium.

Applicants argue that the term "physiological state is changed" means that the cell division of the plant tissue to which the gene is introduced is activated by the centrifugation treatment and points to support from data from Hiel Declaration filed on November 13, 2007 (pp. 10-11 of response). This argument is not found persuasive because if centrifugation causes "physiological" changes then this would occur no matter what type of explant is used. Hiel declaration is not considered because Applicants have not provided sufficient reasons why it was not presented earlier.

Applicants argue that Tables 1-3 were to show the technical aspects of the present invention through experimental data using different media and also points support to Hiel declaration (p. 12 of response). This argument is not found persuasive because Tables 2 and 3 do not show significant difference in N media or K media. With regard to the Hiel declaration it has not been considered for reasons stated above.